

**EPA Air Toxics Pilot Working Group**  
**Draft Meeting Summary**  
**October 29, 2001**

**Members Attending:** Hollie Dellisanti, Laura Hobson, Kyle Dreyfuss-Wells, Amy Simpson, Glenn Landers, Anjali Mathur, Bill Skowronski, Reva Heifetz (for Joe Calabrese), Michael Krzywicki, Bob Leidich, Kevin Snape, Ron Kunkle, Paige Akins, Emily Lee, Stuart Greenberg, Rev. Marvin Smith, Tim Nieberding, Tom McLeary, Mike Suver, Marty Gelfand, Eleanor Bycoski, Victoria Peterlin.

**Members Absent:** Amy Ryder, Virginia Aveni, Rev. Hockett, Jerome Walcott, Mandie Domanovic, Mamie Bell, Jacquie Gillon, Dennis Finn, Elizabeth Shaw, Richard King, Bill Davis.

**Facilitators:** Patrick Field, Sanda Kaufman, and Allison Berland

**Decisions Made**

Number	Decision
#5	Implement Smoke-Free Home Pledge Campaign at no cost as part of the homes subcommittee in November 2001.

The Ohio Air Toxics Working Group convened for the fifth time at the Levin College of Urban Affairs, Cleveland State University. The facilitators began by reviewing the agenda and noted that they would be preparing this meeting summary.

**Review of Past Meeting Summaries and Outstanding Action Items**

The facilitators reviewed the status of the meeting summaries for August and September. The Working Group approved both August and September meeting summaries. The facilitator made note of the handouts distributed at the table, which included the draft vendor policy, subcommittee charge, groundrules, past meeting summaries, revised matrix for evaluating potential projects, and priority criteria.

One member commented that he was having difficulties accessing the website for the Cleveland Air Toxics Pilot. The facilitator said to forward all problems or concerns about the website to him.

There were no questions regarding outstanding action items.

### **Report from Schools Subcommittee**

Emily Lee, coordinator, reported on the status of the Schools Subcommittee. The subcommittee has prioritized the projects they are interested in working on, which includes Education, Tools for Schools, and the GE Lighting National Energy Program. One member asked how the GE Lighting project relates to this project's goal of reducing air toxics. An EPA member responded that introducing energy efficient lamps not only saves money, it also reduces PCBs through removing older lighting ballasts filled with PCBs and reduces air emissions from electric power plants.

Regarding Tools for Schools, Mary Smith suggested to consider looking at hazardous chemicals in relation to indoor air quality. By the next Working Group meeting, the Schools subcommittee hopes to have a project to propose that will have a dollar figure attached to it.

### **Report from Business Subcommittee**

Facilitator Pat Field reported on the status of the Business Subcommittee. The subcommittee has been exploring options to increase their information base to help in project development. One option is to hire an intern to gather data needs for the subcommittee. There are different kinds of data available, including the Toxics Release Inventory. The City has provided the subcommittee maps of businesses in the areas for review and comment.

The subcommittee expressed interest in working with other subcommittees on crosscutting issues, like the fleet retrofit project and non-idling measures (targeting truckstops, promoting education/policy initiatives). One concern expressed by the subcommittee is that there are so many businesses, it is difficult to determine where to focus the subcommittee's resources. It was noted that it may take some time for the business subcommittee to develop specific, effective projects to recommend.

### **Report from Home Subcommittee**

Coordinator Emily Lee reported on the status of the Home Subcommittee. The subcommittee has decided to focus on a Household Toxic Collection Campaign. The campaign might include some or all of the following to incorporate and integrate multiple efforts:

- Household toxics collections
- Mercury thermometer exchange
- Gasoline can exchange
- IPM
- Smoke-Free Homes Pledge
- Community Education

At the October 12<sup>th</sup> meeting, the subcommittee discussed the possibility of doing a project in conjunction with the Great American Smokeout on November 15, 2001. The subcommittee proposed a project that would entail setting up two stations in the St. Clair Superior and Slavic Village neighborhoods to encourage people to designate their homes as “Smoke Free.” The project could be implemented without any cost to the Working Group. One member asked how the Working Group could measure the success of the project. A suggestion was to have a postcard to follow-up with individuals. Another suggestion was to inquire about whether the American Lung Association could share the evaluation results with the subcommittee.

The subcommittee felt that this was a good opportunity to get information about the pilot project out to the community. Members of the Working Group expressed support for the project. The Working Group decided to accept the Smoke-Free Home Pledge Campaign as their first project.

### **Report from Transportation Subcommittee**

Kathleen Gaiser, coordinator, reported on the work of the transportation subcommittee.

Kathleen noted that the transportation subcommittee would like to work with and seek input from the business subcommittee about carpooling issues, off-road equipment, and low sulfur fuels for RTA. The subcommittee is also interested in talking with the school committee about gas caps. One member suggested looking into RTA’s Rack and Roll program, which is a project to encourage installation of bike racks at institutions and businesses. Another member brought up the concern of traffic buildup in neighborhoods and wondered if it was possible to change the timing of the lights to keep cars moving. The facilitator suggested checking in with Bill Davis of NOACA to find out more information about this concern.

The transportation subcommittee hopes to have at least a few project recommendations by the next Working Group meeting.

### **Pilot Project Timeline and Budget**

The facilitators reviewed the timeline for the project. There were no comments from Working Group members.

Mary Smith provided information about the funding mechanisms for Working Group projects. The two possibilities are a purchase order in the short term and a cooperative agreement with one organization in the longer term. A government purchasing order is usually through an existing contract. A cooperative agreement is an agreement with a state, city or nonprofit organization, which acts as the funding recipient for the project. The recipient should have a mission that overlaps with the EPA and cannot be a for-profit company. Purchasing through a cooperative agreement has to be a competitive process, documenting the number of vendors solicited and so forth.

Mary thought that most of the early funding for initial projects could most likely be handled by direct purchase orders. However, in the long run, she suggested establishing a cooperative agreement. US EPA overhead costs are swallowed by the EPA. EPA Cleveland noted the importance of having one organization manage the funds to avoid extra overhead costs, coordinator problems, and so forth. Members discussed possible partnerships, including the neighborhood development organizations and NOACA. Mary will look into possible financial arrangements and report back to the group next meeting.

### **Budget Sequencing Issues**

With subcommittee groups moving at different paces, the Working Group began to discuss how to allocate the budget. The facilitators asked if the Working Group wanted to allocated a minimum amount to spend, such as \$20,000 for each subcommittee, or to allot a certain amount now to the Working Group as a whole, such as \$100,000 for short-term projects.

One member suggested that the subcommittee groups come up with their best plan and estimate what they might need to fund it. Another member asked if there was a rush on this subject. Rather than formulate an exact need, how about waiting to see what the needs are of the subcommittees.

The facilitators asked the Working Group members to review their best short-term projects in light of how much they will cost, whether they would like them to be implemented sooner versus later, and consider how they would like to allocate the money for short-term versus long-term projects. After this review, the subcommittees should come to the December with a recommendation, if any, for proceeding with a one to a few short term, relatively low cost projects.

### **Scheduling Next Meeting**

The facilitators noted that some Working Group members have a difficult time coming to meetings held on Monday. In consideration of this problem, several meeting dates were posited, including Tuesday November 27, Monday December 3, and Tuesday December 11. The group did not reach a consensus on a meeting date. The facilitators said that they would talk with members over the upcoming week and try to find a day that is suitable to the most people.

The meeting adjourned at 9 p.m. Please note that EPA's website for this pilot is at <http://www.epa.gov/cleveland/>